

am, I expected the body to support funding for the Mexican-American Commission and the Indian Commission as well. Wrong as I usually am, I was wrong again. We're looking at a situation where five minutes ago we just appropriated \$60,000 for the bees and I think that's probably an important cause. I think these commissions are as equal, if not greater, an important cause. What we're dealing here with is a situation where we've got commissions that have been established for a reason a little over 13 years ago. Now we cannot fund them so we say, let's make sure that we don't have this problem anymore. Let's make them legitimately go out of existence, let's wipe them off the books, let's not have to deal with them again. I don't think that's the right way to do it. I don't think it's fair to say the Commission on the Status of Women is any more important than the Commission on Indian Affairs, Commission for the Mexican-Americans. I think we're dealing with the situation here where it's boiled down to basically a political struggle, who has the political ability to garner the votes necessary to keep themselves in existence. I would urge you to reject the committee amendments. As I said earlier, I have a kill motion that is filed on the bill. I would like to see us kill the bill in its entirety, but I think we need to deal with all three of these commissions with the term that we've grown very fond to this session on an equal playing or a fair playing field. I would urge the body to reject the committee amendments. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner, then Senator Abboud.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, LB 1089 was introduced in order to provide the opportunity to have public hearing to review the, in effect, the elimination of funding for these three advocacy type agencies during the 1985 session. I would agree with those who believe, as I do, that the committee amendment ought to be rejected because as a matter of policy, there is no difference between any of them. The position that I would take is that either they all ought to be funded or they all ought to be not funded because there is no essential difference. I have no problem with the concept that the scope of government is adequately served if they are eliminated. I could make just as good an argument to suggest as I've said before three, four other agencies to reflect other interest groups that could also perhaps be